



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,315	08/24/2001	Stepan Sokolov	SUNIP843/P6724	2845

22434 7590 09/06/2005

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 70250  
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER
----------

WOOD, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/939,315

Applicant(s)

SOKOLOV, STEPAN

Examiner

William H. Wood

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5,7,8,11-15 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5,7,8,11-15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-15 and 17-22 are pending and have been examined.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peter van der **Linden**, "Just Java and Beyond" (third edition) in view of **Blandy** et al. (USPN 6,654,778) and in further view of **O'Conner** et al. (USPN 6,026,485) as recited in the previous office action of 23 September 2004 and thus not repeated for brevity.

#### **Claim 1**

Cited prior art further disclosed *pushing a reference to said JAVA object on an execution stack* (**Blandy**: column 5, lines 19-31; **O'Connor**: column 3, lines 5-15)

#### **Claims 20-22**

The claims are substantially the same as for claims 8, 11 and 13 and are rejected in the same manner. Further the cited prior art disclosed *wherein said JAVA Bytecode instruction operates to determine said string representation associated with said JAVA*

*object (O'Connor: column 62, lines 1-15, note aload\_<n>; Blandy: column 5, lines 19-31); and thereby allowing said string representation to be determined without invoking a JAVA method (Blandy: column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 18).*

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 21 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: **Linden** and **Blandy** do not disclose using a Java Bytecode instruction for retrieving a string representation associated with a Java object, thereby allowing the string representation to be determined without invoking a Java method; and that **O'Connor's** Aload instruction does not render the claims obvious. Upon review of the cited references and the original rejections, Applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive.

First, the original claims do not call for using a Java Bytecode instruction to avoid the need of a Java method. Further, as Applicant pointed out on the top of page 11 of the submitted arguments, a portion of **Blandy** is directed toward replacing methods with native code. This certainly is read upon by the phrase "without invoking a Java "to\_string" method. **O'Connor's** (not to mention **Blandy**, column 5, lines 19-31) aload\_<n> instruction (**O'Connor**: column 62, lines 1-15) does indicate a variable (or string representation). Thus, the rejections are maintained as above indicated.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 101 are withdrawn. Further, Drawings, Specification and Claim Objections are withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2193

**Conclusion**

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

**Correspondence Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 9:00am - 5:30pm Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)-272-3719. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

  
William H. Wood  
August 30, 2005

  
ANIL KHATRI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER